

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15, are amended, claims 2, 6, 9, 13, and 16 are cancelled without prejudice and new claims 17 and 18 are added; thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added and, accordingly, entry and approval of the amended claims and the new claims are respectfully requested.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15 and 17-18 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12 and 14-15 are rejected.

TITLE:

In accordance with the foregoing, the title of the invention, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments, is amended. Withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

ITEMS 2-3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action at item 3 rejects claims 8, 10-12 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are allegedly "directed to more than one statutory class of invention." In accordance with the foregoing, claims 8, 10-12 and 14-15 are amended, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 10-12 and 14-15 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim rejections.

ITEMS 4-6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7 AND 15-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, AS ALLEGEDLY BEING INDEFINITE.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, in item 6, rejects claim 1, and claims 3-5 and 7 based on their dependency on claim 1, because claim 1 allegedly fails to provide antecedent basis for "the specific window" recitation. In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 is amended, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, claim rejection.

The Office Action, in item 6, further rejects claim 15, because, allegedly, “the word ‘should’ in line 5 of the claim renders the claim vague.” In accordance with the foregoing, claim 15 is amended, taking into consideration the Examiner’s comments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, claim rejection.

ITEMS 6-7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS ALLEGEDLY BEING ANTICIPATED BY HITOSHI, JAPANESE PUBLICATION 2000-035847, HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS “HITOSHI.”

This rejection is respectfully traversed

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are allegedly anticipated by Hitoshi.

Hitoshi discloses a PC (personal Computer) having a main display 21 and plural sub displays 22-24, and displaying one of plural windows displayed on the main display 21 on the sub display, as shown in Figs. 6-12. Furthermore, Hitoshi discloses that window select buttons 214-216 are displayed outside of the window display area on the main display, as shown in Fig. 12. For example, Hitoshi at paragraph 35, lines 4-7 recites:

If the [D1] carbon button 214 is pushed at this time, the information field 71 of the main display unit 21 will be displayed on the sub display unit 22. That is, if the [D2] carbon button 215 is pushed, the information on the field 71 of the main display unit 21 will be displayed on the sub display unit 23...

In contrast, the claimed embodiment provides “said processing unit executes plural tasks being started, displays each window according to said plural tasks on said display device, and displays an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each of the plural window displays, to select said specific window.” In other words, the main display displays “an external monitor output selection menu” on a menu bar of each window of the display device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hitoshi fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed “processing unit executes plural tasks being started, displays each window according to said plural tasks on said display device, and displays an external monitor output selection menu in a menu bar of each of the plural window displays, to select said specific window,” because Hitoshi only discloses using “carbon buttons” to transfer the information on the field of a main display to a subdisplay. One benefit of the claimed embodiment, for example, is that since the select menu of external monitor is displayed on menu bar of each window, the

window display area in the main display does not have to be reduced even if the select menu for external monitor is provided on the main display.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 8 and 15 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for similar reasons as independent claim 1.

Dependent claims are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

For example, Hitoshi fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "processing unit outputs image data of a single effective window selected to the external monitor among plural windows of the display device," as recited in claim 3, and the claimed "processing unit displays the selection menus of the external monitor output with a plurality of output modes in the menu bar of the window of the display device," as recited in claim 4. In other words, Hitoshi fails to disclose an exclusive control of plural window, as described in claims 3 and 4.

NEW CLAIMS 17 and 18:

New claims 17 and 18 are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own.

CONCLUSION

Withdrawal of the rejections of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/644,006

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 29, 2017

By: 
H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501